The Facebook, Inc. v. Connectu, LLC et al Doc. 229 Att. 1

EXHIBIT M

Dockets.Justia.com

Subject: RE: ConnectU Website Performance
From: "Cameron Winklevoss" <Cameron@winklevoss.com>
Date: Sun, 13 Feb 2005 16:06:35 -0500
To: "Dave Tufts" <dave@imarc.net>, "John Taves" <john.taves@pickatime.com>
CC: "Wayne Chang" <drttol@gmail.com>, "Tyler Winklevoss" <Tyler@winklevoss.com>, "Howard Winklevoss" <HWinklevoss@winklevoss.com>, "Fred LeBlanc" <fred@imarc.net>, "Nick Grant" <nick@imarc.net>, "Winston Williams" <MrPrimate@pnwsoft.com>, "Marc Pierrat" <marc@imarc.net>, "Alex Novikov" <anovikov@pickatime.com>, "Joel Voss" <jvoss@pnwsoft.com>, <david.gucwa@i2hub.com>, "David Gucwa" <dgucwa@gmail.com>, <dave@imarc.net>

Dave,

"Right before midnight, someone from ATT.net (24.22.165.112) was logged in working apache and apache logs."

Winston, whose IP is 24.22.165.112, could not have logged in at 12pm EST because he was at dinner at that time and his computer was off (he was not home from 9PM EST - 3AM EST). Also, he is on Comcast, not ATT. Where did you find this information?

The last login before the server went down at 11:59 EST was:

Feb 12 23:51:49 connectu sshd[32107]: Accepted publickey for web from 209.58.197.57 port 4166 ssh2

and looking at the file /var/log/auth.log, shows:

18 sonofkeg.imarc.net (209.58.197.57) 123.899 ms 107.948 ms 103.453 ms

Someone from imarc was the last person to log in at 11:51 PM EST right before the server went down. Is this correct?

-Cameron

-----Original Message-----
From: Dave Tufts [mailto:dave@imarc.net]
Sent: Sun 2/13/2005 10:32 AM
To: John Taves
Cc: Wayne Chang; Cameron Winklevoss; Tyler Winklevoss; Howard Winklevoss; Fred LeBlanc; Nick Grant; Winston Williams; Marc Pierrat; Alex Novikov; Joel Voss; david.gucwa@i2hub.com; David Gucwa; dave@imarc.net
Subject: Re: ConnectU Website Performance
The root of the problem is too many people working on the server, without one person overseeing the work or responsibility.

Right before midnight, someone from ATT.net (24.22.165.112) was logged in working apache and apache logs.

There certainly could be a problem with the new code, not being compatible with the old cron scripts. There are a couple PHP scripts triggered by cron via WGET to re-write certain pages statically. Right now, 'Recent Blogs' page isn't working correctly - The recent blogs on the homepage do not show up on the Recent Blogs page...

Also, whoever restarted the server, didn't do it correctly. Right now it's impossible to buy anything on Jungalu, because Apache wasn't started in SSL mode:

The server was restarted at 2:59 am, like this:
    80 2:59 sudo apachectl restart

If the server isn't running it should you should start it like this:
sudo apachectl startssl

...or even better, use the startup script:
sudo /usr/local/etc/rc.d/apache.sh

Cameron, let Nick <nick@imarc.net> know if there's anything specific you want iMarc to do.

Thanks,
Dave

> Joel restarted apache. He will look into the cause tomorrow, but it looked like some wget process had spawned a ton of times.
>
> jt
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Wayne Chang [mailto:drttol@gmail.com]
> Sent: Saturday, February 12, 2005 9:20 PM
> To: Cameron Winklevoss; Tyler Winklevoss; John Taves; Howard Winklevoss; David Tufts; Fred LeBlanc; Nick Grant; Winston Williams; Marc Pierrat; Alex Novikov; Joel Voss; david.gucwa@i2hub.com; David Gucwa
> Subject: ConnectU Website Performance
>
> Hi Everyone,
>
> It is midnight EST -- peak hours for college-oriented websites.
>
> www.connectu.com is down.
>
> This isn't the first time that CU has been down around this time. Winston has also noticed significant lag when there are users on CU.
>
> What can we do about this? As I understand it, we're currently on a $299/mo server. iMarc told me the server specs on it are real crappy.
>
> I've been told it's either a) the server and its capacity/bandwidth, or b) the server code itself.
>
> Assuming (a), the fix would be to get a better server.
>
> Assuming (b), the fix would be to get our dev guys to optimize the sites for a crappy server.
>
> (a) costs money and minimal time. (b) costs a lot of time.
>
> We've seen this problem for months now. Why don't we assume (a), while working on (b)?
>
> In other words, why don't we move the server to a comparable bsd/linux server with higher CPU and specs, instead of spending time trying to optimize the site on a lower machine?
>
> Users are complaining about the availability of the site, and we know there is a limitation on the server at the hardware level. The cost of removing that limitation is a couple hundred dollars, and we can remove that as a reason on why the CU site isn't performing well under strain. We can also load balance on the new server, and also gain benefits that way.

> I'm promoting CU on i2hub, and it doesn't make me look good when the site doesn't load while I'm telling people that it's better than our competition.
>
> Wayn Chang

This transmission, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) or entity named above and may contain confidential and privileged information. If you received this and are not the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, unauthorized distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately contact the sender as indicated above to arrange the proper handling of the information.